

ARKANSAS SUPREME COURT

No. 08-733

JAMES E. SMITH
Appellant

v.

LARRY NORRIS, DIRECTOR,
ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTION
Appellee

Opinion Delivered April 9, 2009

PRO SE MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION OF DISMISSAL
OF APPEAL; MOTION TO AMEND
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
[CIRCUIT COURT OF JEFFERSON
COUNTY, CV 2008-58, HON. JODI
RAINES DENNIS, JUDGE]

MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
DENIED; MOTION TO AMEND
MOOT.

PER CURIAM

Appellant James E. Smith filed a pro se petition for writ of habeas corpus that the circuit court dismissed. This court dismissed the appeal. *Smith v. Norris*, 08-733 (Ark. Oct. 30, 2008) (per curiam). We denied appellant's motion for reconsideration. *Smith v. Norris*, 08-733 (Ark. Jan. 30, 2009) (per curiam). Appellant has once again filed a motion for reconsideration of our previous decisions in this matter and has additionally filed a motion to amend his twenty-four page motion for reconsideration that is over one hundred pages in length.

In his motion for reconsideration, appellant asserts that we erred in concluding that he raised new issues not presented to the trial court in his motion for reconsideration, that he did state grounds for relief in his petition for writ of habeas corpus because he argued constitutional violations, that these constitutional violations were sufficient to cause the trial court to lose jurisdiction, and that he can be granted relief as a result of those violations. Appellant further indicates that he disagrees with

our conclusions. It appears that his disagreement is with our interpretation of the arguments he presented and with the application of precedent with which he disputes the holding. He urges us to hold pro se litigants to a more lenient standard than those represented by counsel.

Pro se litigants, however, are held to the same standards as attorneys. *See Kennedy v. Byers*, 368 Ark. 516, 247 S.W.3d 525 (2007) (per curiam); *Elliott v. State*, 342 Ark. 237, 27 S.W.3d 432 (2000). Appellant presents no compelling argument to overturn our previous cases, or the conclusions drawn concerning our interpretation of his arguments presented to the trial court. We acknowledge that appellant did, as he asserts, present claims of constitutional violations in his petition. For the reasons stated in our previous opinions, however, those alleged violations were not sufficient to raise claims cognizable in habeas proceedings in this state.

Because appellant's second motion for reconsideration is without merit, his motion to amend is moot. Appellant has now twice submitted motions to reconsider the dismissal of his appeal that were without merit. For that reason, we will not consider further submissions for reconsideration of those decisions, and direct our clerk to reject any further such submissions.

Motion for reconsideration denied; motion to amend moot.